play's audience. Both Deianira and Heracles perform actions that lead to their ruin, a ruin unimagined and unintended by them. Here the poet joins their actions together by the repeated use of $\beta \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \omega$: each one "dips" (arrows, appropriately, for the man, a cloak for the woman) with fatal consequences. Deianira, moreover, hesitates over her action: no sooner does she explain her use of the philter than she expresses her uncertainty and diffidence (584–87). In the exchange between Deianira and the chorus that follows (588–97), Sophocles shows her rejecting the chorus' advice of caution. Hate learning, it has often been observed, is fundamental to this drama. Many elements in the play and the tradition (cf. Hes. frag. 25. 17–22 M.-W.) lead the audience to expect dire consequences from Deianira's sending the robe, consequences that Deianira, although hesitant about her action, cannot foresee. In this context the striking repetition of $\beta \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \omega$ adds to the irony and is a further, and hitherto unnoticed, example of Sophocles' verbal artistry.

MICHAEL R. HALLERAN University of Washington

- 11. As F. Solmsen has recently argued: see "ἀλλ' εἰδέναι χρὴ δρῶσαν: The Meaning of Sophocles, *Trachiniae* 588-93," *AJP* 106 (1985): 490-96.
- 12. On this topic see, e.g., C. Whitman, Sophocles: A Study of Heroic Humanism (Cambridge, Mass., 1951), pp. 103-21, and S. Lawrence, "The Dramatic Epistemology of Sophocles' Trachiniae," Phoenix 32 (1978): 288-304.
- 13. For instructive comments on earlier drafts of this paper I am grateful to the Editor, the anonymous referee, and my colleagues James J. Clauss and Mary Whitlock Blundell.

A NOTE ON THE FIRST THREE VICTIMS OF OSTRACISM ('Αθηναίων Πολιτεία 22. 4)

καὶ πρῶτος ἀστρακίσθη τῶν ἐκείνου συγγενῶν Ἵππαρχος Χάρμου Κολλυτεύς, δι' δν καὶ μάλιστα τὸν νόμον ἔθηκεν ὁ Κλεισθένης, ἐξελάσαι βουλόμενος αὐτόν.

The clause καὶ πρῶτος ἀστρακίσθη τῶν ἐκείνου Ἵππαρχος Χάρμου Κολλυτεύς is generally understood to mean "The first man to be ostracized was one of his [sc. Pisistratus'] relatives, Hipparchus son of Charmus, of Collytus." Those who interpret the clause in this way evidently take it to be both a paraphrase of Androtion on ostracism (FGrH 324 F 6 περὶ δὲ τούτου [sc. Hipparchus]

1. P. J. Rhodes, trans., The "Athenian Constitution" (Harmondsworth, 1984), p. 65; Rhodes' translation accords with his apparent reluctance to conceive of the Alcmaeonids as relatives of the tyrants: cf. P. J. Rhodes, A Commentary on the Aristotelian "Athenaion Politeia" (Oxford, 1981), p. 186. See also F. G. Kenyon, trans., Aristotel on the Athenian Constitution (London, 1895), p. 40; K. von Fritz and E. Kapp, trans., Aristotel's "Constitution of Athens" and Related Texts (New York, 1950), p. 91; H. Rackham, trans., The "Athenian Constitution" (London, 1952), p. 67; J. Warrington, trans., Aristotle's "Politics" and "Athenian Constitution" (London, 1959), p. 264, n. 4; cf. also D. J. Phillips, "Athenian Ostracism," in Hellenika: Essays on Greek Politics and History, ed. G. H. R. Horsley (North Ryde, New South Wales, 1982), p. 29. The translation of G. Mathieu and B. Hausoullier, Aristote: "Constitution d' Athènes" (Paris, 1922), p. 24 ("Le premier qui fut frappé de l'ostracisme parmi ses parents fut Hipparchos, fils de Charmos, du dème Collytos") has apparently been lost on most English translators and commentators.

'Ανδροτίων ἐν τῆι $\bar{\beta}$ φήσιν ὅτι συγγενὴς μὲν ἦν Πεισιστράτου τοῦ τυράννου καὶ πρῶτος ἐξωστρακίσθη κτλ.) and a restatement of 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία 22. 3 (τότε πρῶτον ἐχρήσαντο τῷ νόμῳ περὶ τὸν ὀστρακισμόν).²

This interpretation should be rejected for several reasons. First, πρῶτος expects a partitive genitive and should be construed with the phrase τῶν ἐκείνου συγγενῶν, not detached from it.3 At 22.6 an almost identical construction occurs and is so generally understood: καὶ πρῶτος ἀστρακίσθη τῶν ἄπωθεν τῆς τυραννίδος Ξάνθιππος ὁ ᾿Αρίφρονος, that is, "the first man unconnected with the tyranny to be ostracized was Xanthippus son of Ariphron."⁴ The parallel structure of the two sentences is altogether telling for the meaning of 22. 4, since it shows very clearly that the author wanted to contrast two groups, not an individual and a group. Hipparchus, the son of Charmus, Megacles, the son of Hippocrates and an Alcmaeonid, and a third victim, very possibly another Alcmaeonid (perhaps Callias, the son of Cratias),⁵ are actually described both as συγγενεῖς τοῦ τυράννου and as φίλοι τῶν τυράννων (22. 4, 6). The implication that they were related to the Pisistratids is by no means diminished by the second description, since φίλοι can certainly include "relatives" and is here synonymous with συγγενεῖς. The phrase in 22.6 recalls the more precise designation of these early victims of ostracism as συγγενεῖς τοῦ τυράννου, for as J. E. Sandys has noted, of $\ddot{\alpha}\pi\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$ can denote the exact opposite of oi συγγενεῖς, and the virtually identical phrasing makes it plain that the author intended just such an antithesis.7

There is further evidence that the first three men ostracized were kinsmen of Pisistratus. In what appears to be, *mutatis mutandis*, a paraphrase of the information given in the $A\theta\eta\nu\alpha i\omega\nu$ $\Pi o\lambda\iota\tau\epsilon i\alpha$, Alcibiades the Younger—the maternal great-grandson of the ostracized Megacles—concedes his ancestors'

- 2. See F. G. Kenyon, Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens (Oxford, 1891), pp. 58-59; F. Jacoby, Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens (Oxford, 1949), p. 337, n. 42. On Androtion and the Ath. Pol., see esp. H. Bloch, review of Die Fragmente der griechische Historiker by F. Jacoby, vol. 3.b Supplement, in Gnomon 31 (1959): 492-93; G. V. Sumner, "Androtion F 6 and Ath. Pol. 22," BICS 11 (1964): 79-86; J. J. Keaney, "The Text of Androtion F 6 and the Origins of Ostracism," Historia 18 (1970): 1-11; see also Rhodes, Commentary, p. 269. For a recent view, see K. R. Walters, "FGrHist 324, F 6: A New Conjecture," RhM 127 (1984): 223-36.
- 3. The possibility of this construction was queried, without elaboration, by P. J. Bicknell, "Was Megakles Hippokratous Alopekethen Ostracized Twice?" AC 44 (1975): 173, n. 22; his query has been unjustly ignored.
 - 4. So Rhodes, "Athenian Constitution," p. 65; cf. also the other translations cited in n. 1 above.
- 5. On Megacles son of Hippocrates, see J. K. Davies, Athenian Propertied Families, 600-300 B.C. (Oxford, 1971), pp. 379-80; P. J. Bicknell, Studies in Athenian Politics and Genealogy, Historia Einzelschriften 19 (Wiesbaden, 1972), pp. 72-73. On Callias son of Cratias as the third victim, see E. Vanderpool, Ostracism at Athens (Cincinnati, 1970), pp. 21-22, and Rhodes, Commentary, p. 276; as an Alcmaeonid, Bicknell, Studies, pp. 64-71, and "Athenian Politics and Genealogy: Some Pendants," Historia 23 (1974): 147-50.
- 6. On political φίλοι, see W. R. Connor, *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens* (Princeton, 1971), pp. 30-31: "All these (*i.e.*, family, members of the same *genos*, drinking companions) were *philoi*, a word which in ancient usage normally included both friend and relative, all those who were really close to a man. Beginning Greek books tell one to translate it 'friend', 'one's own people' might be more exact. But we need not quibble over the word, provided the inclusiveness of the Greek term is kept in mind." R. Develin, "Cleisthenes and Ostracisms: Precedents and Intentions," *Antichthon* 11 (1977): 21, seems to suggest this synonymity.
- 7. Aristotle's "Constitution of Athens" (London, 1912), note on p. 93, adducing Arist. Pol. 1262a29 and 1280b18 among other instances; on the antithesis, see, e.g., W. G. Forrest, "Themistocles and Argos," CQ 10 (1960): 233.

affinity to the tyrants, although he seems to place that association before the establishment of the tyranny (Isoc. 16. 25 συγγενεῖς γὰρ ὄντες Πεισιστράτου καὶ πρὶν εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν καταστῆναι μάλιστ' αὐτῷ χρώμενοι τῶν πολιτῶν, οὐκ ἡξίωσαν μετασχεῖν τῆς ἐκείνου τυραννίδος, ἀλλ' εἴλοντο φυγεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ τοὺς πολίτας ἰδεῖν δουλεύοντας). Alcibiades' concession of kinship substantiates the implication of ᾿Αθηναίων Πολιτεία 22. 4.8

Much of what Alcibiades says in his speech about his ancestors is false. The Alcmaeonids actually helped Pisistratus to establish his second tyranny and thus to enslave Athens; the family was not, as Alcibiades goes on to say, absent from Athens for the tyranny's duration, nor did its cooperation with the Pisistratids end with the tyranny's establishment. Alcibiades' falsifications echo earlier attempts to revise the record of the Alcmaeonids' relations with the tyrants; these attempts emerge most clearly in Herodotus' report of the family's initial relations with Pisistratus (1.60) and in his protestations of the family's "perpetual" opposition to the tyrants and "perpetual" exile from Athens while the tyranny endured (6. 123). 10 Herodotus' sources were indisputably Alcmaeonid, the facts sufficiently well known and damaging to require such attempts. 11 The same pressures to revise apparently caused Alcibiades to recast his family's history and to antedate the συγγενεία of the families. We know of no kinship and, indeed, no reason for kinship between the city-centered Alcmaeonids and the outlander Pisistratus before the latter married the daughter of Megacles. grandfather of his ostracized namesake. 12 That very brief marriage, which produced no offspring, cannot account for Alcibiades' admission of συγγενεία.

The family's attempts at revision notwithstanding, the history of Megacles' branch of the Alcmaeonids in particular indicates a close and lasting cooperation with the Pisistratids that is perhaps best explained by high-level intermarriage. As has been noted in passing, Megacles the Elder helped to establish

^{8.} On the significance of this passage, see A. E. Raubitschek, "Zur attischen Genealogie," RhM 98 (1955): 262; cf. F. Willemsen, "Ostraka," MDAI(A) 80 (1965): 103. On Alcibiades the Younger and his family connections, see Bicknell, Studies, pp. 80-81, and Davies, Athenian Propertied Families, pp. 16-22. Rhodes, Commentary, p. 186, too lightly dismisses Alcibiades' admission of kinship.

^{9.} Cf. the sixth-century archon-list, SEG 10. 352; and see B. D. Meritt, "Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia 8 (1939): 59-65, and D. W. Bradeen, "The Fifth-Century Athenian Archon List," Hesperia 32 (1963): 187-208.

^{10.} Alcibiades' father, when addressing the Spartans, voiced nearly identical sentiments about his family's "perpetual" opposition to the tyranny (Thuc. 6. 89. 5), which suggests that such revisions were traditional in the family. Cf. P. J. Bicknell, "The Exile of the Alkmeonidai During the Peisistratid Tyranny," *Historia* 19 (1970): 130.

^{11.} On Herodotus and the Alcmaeonids, see, e.g., Jacoby, Atthis, p. 335, nn. 25-27, and Bicknell, "Exile of the Alkmeonidai," p. 130. Herodotus' very imperfect apology for the Alcmaeonids accused of treason around the time of Marathon (6. 121-24) appears to be the outcome of yet another Alcmaeonid attempt at revision: see W. W. How and J. Wells, A Commentary on Herodotus, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1912), p. 115, and D. Gillis, Collaboration with the Persians, Historia Einzelschriften 34 (Wiesbaden, 1979), pp. 45-54. Anti-tyrannism at Athens in the wake of Marathon and Salamis was the likeliest goad for such revisions.

^{12.} Marriage: Hdt. 1. 60-61. The evidence we have (Hdt. 1. 59-61, Ath. Pol. 13-16, Plut. Sol. 29-31) marks the family of Pisistratus as politically unimportant before him: regardless of what weight we attach to the family's Pylian origin (Hdt. 5. 65. 3) or to the archonship of the tyrant's namesake (669/68 B.C.: Paus. 2. 24. 7; cf. T. J. Cadoux, "The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hypsichides," JHS 68 [1948]: 90), Pisistratus' formation of a third party shows that he was an upstart, new to Athenian Politics and without a significant, established base of city-support (pace Davies, Athenian Propertied Families, p. 445).

Pisistratus' second tyranny, cemented their alliance by marrying his daughter to the tyrant, and may even have gone so far as to name his son after Hippocrates. the father of Pisistratus.¹³ Although that alliance was soon dissolved and the Alcmaeonids exiled for a time after Pallene (546), some of Megacles' family must have returned not long after, for Cleisthenes, another son of Megacles, held the archonship for 525/24, the year following the archonship of Pisistratus' son Hippias.¹⁴ The significant collaboration implied by that sequence has been noted elsewhere; but it is worth recalling Thucydides' pronouncement that the tyrants "managed always to keep one of their own in office" (6. 54. 6 αἰεί τινα ἐπεμέλοντο σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς εἶναι), together with Andocides' clear intimation that, unlike his own ancestor Leogoras, some who had fought against the tyrants were later reconciled with them, married into the family, and ruled Athens with the Pisistratids (2. 26 έξὸν αὐτῷ [sc. Leogoras] διαλλαχθέντι τῆς ἔχθρας καὶ γενομένω κηδεστῆ ἄρξαι μετ' ἐκείνων τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς πόλεως, εἵλετο μᾶλλον κτλ.). 15 Megacles' branch of the Alcmaeonids was on conspicuously good terms with the Pisistratids obviously from well before the time Cleisthenes became archon until the death of Hipparchus in 514: the affinity to which Alcibiades so uncomfortably but unmistakably alludes and about which his forebears would naturally have been silent certainly explains the resiliency and the viability of these Alcmaeonids under the tyrants. 16

A final point. Androtion's statement on ostracism, as it is preserved by Harpocration (FGrH 324 F 6, quoted above), does not contradict this interpretation of Aθηναίων Πολιτεία 22. 4 and in any case should not be used to justify a tortured reading of the clause. The correct interpretation of the first words of 22. 4 is "And the first of his [sc. Pisistratus'] relatives to be ostracized was Hipparchus, the son of Charmus, of the deme Collytus. . . ."

This interpretation has many consequences for our understanding of the Alcmaeonids and Athenian politics in the sixth and early fifth centuries that cannot be given their full due here. A few salient points are, however, worth mentioning. Kinship with the tyrants and the suspicions that it engendered among the Athenians better explain why the Alcmaeonids were specifically

^{13.} On Hippocrates, the father of Pisistratus, as namesake of the ostracized Megacles' father, see A. E. Raubitschek, *Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949), p. 339; cf. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families*, p. 379.

^{14.} See n. 9 above and C. W. J. Eliot and M. F. McGregor, "Kleisthenes: Eponymous Archon, 525/24 B.C.," *Phoenix* 14 (1960): 27-35. On the date of Pallene (Hdt. 1. 62), see M. F. McGregor, "Phormion and Peisistratos," *Phoenix* 28 (1974): 18-21.

^{15.} On the implications of the archon-list, see, e.g., A. Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants* (London, 1959), pp. 109-11, and R. Sealey, *A History of the Greek City-States ca. 700-338 B.C.* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1976), pp. 135-37. I cannot agree with M. White ("Hippias and the Athenian Archon List," in *Polis and Imperium: Studies in Honour of Edward Togo Salmon*, ed. J. A. S. Evans [Toronto, 1974], p. 93, n. 7) that Thucydides' σφῶν αὐτῶν is "deliberately vague": surely "their own men" must include readily identifiable συγγενεῖς and φίλοι of the tyrants (see n. 6 above). I should like to thank an anonymous referee for bringing the passage in Andocides to my attention.

^{16.} Death of Hipparchus: Cadoux, "Athenian Archons," pp. 112-13. On the exile of the Alcmaeonids after Hipparchus' death: schol. Aristid. 3. 118 Dindorf; cf. Rhodes, Commentary, p. 234.

^{17.} On the possibility that Harpocration garbled the text of Androtion in transmitting it, see G. Kaibel, Stil und Text der "Πολιτεία 'Αθηναίων" (Berlin, 1893), pp. 174-75; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Aristoteles und Athen, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1893), pp. 123, n. 3; cf. also Bloch, rev. of Jacoby, pp. 492-93; Sumner, "Androtion F 6," p. 83; and Keaney, "The Text of Androtion," pp. 1-11.

accused of collaboration with the Persians and the Pisistratids, and why members of their yévoc (and some simply associated with that yévoc) were ostracized or candidates for ostracism through the 480s, beginning with the chef de famille, Megacles. 18 The unpopularity of that kinship also helps to account for the conspicuous absence of the Alcmaeonids (in the male line) from Athenian politics after 480.¹⁹ Their affinity to the Pisistratids caused an embarrassment that, from the testimony of Alcibiades the Younger, appears to have been perpetual. This embarrassment will have increased after the failed Persian Expedition and the elimination of the Pisistratid threat to Athens; it suggests a reason why the Alcmaeonids in the fifth and fourth centuries were at pains to ignore or modify the record of their past affiliation with the Pisistratids, and why they continued to press their claims as Athens' true liberators.²⁰ (Their affinity to the tyrants also helps to explain why the Athenians chose to ignore those claims in spite of their veracity.)²¹ The result of this interpretation is, after all, somewhat disquieting, for it tends to support the cynical appraisal of Alcmaeonid conduct in the sixth century first grounded in the archon-list.²² The family of democracy becomes also the family of tyranny: of all Athenians, Pericles was likened to Pisistratus in manner and appearance.²³ Blood-ties to the old tyrant through Pericles' mother may be to blame for that real or imagined resemblance.24

B. M. LAVELLE Loyola University of Chicago

18. On ostracisms, see R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford, 1969), pp. 40-45. On Megacles as head of the family, see Willemsen, "Ostraka," p. 103, and Davies, Athenian Propertied Families, p. 379. Unlike Alcmaeonids such as Callias and Callixenus, who were charged with medism and treason on ostraca, Megacles was ostracized for other reasons: on ostraca cast against him apparently in 486, Megacles was indirectly linked to Pisistratus through Coisyra, the tyrant's former wife, whom three sherds designate as Megacles' mother (on Megacles and Coisyra, see Davies, Athenian Propertied Families, pp. 380-81), and was otherwise characterized as possessing the qualities of a potential tyrant (see H. B. Mattingly, "Facts and Artifacts: The Researcher and His Tools," Leeds University Review 14 [1971]: 283). These may amount to oblique charges of treason through kinship, but it is more reasonable to infer that envy and the suspicions of a tyrannical bent caused Megacles' ostracism. Marathon obviously opened the door for ostracisms, and the suspicions created by Megacles' connection to the Pisistratids and to those Alemaeonids considered treasonous by Athenian voters must have increased his vulnerability to ostracism; but kinship to the tyrants is much likelier to have become a liability and perhaps even a charge not much later, when συγγενεῖς such as Hipparchus the son of Charmus, Callias the son of Cratias, and, very possibly, Megacles medized after their ostracisms, thereby demonstrating their traitorous nature to the Athenians at home: cf. Lycurg. Leoc. 117, and see G. Busolt, Griechische Geschichte, vol. 2 (Gotha, 1895), p. 661, n. 1, and Mattingly, "Facts and Artifacts," pp. 281-82.

- 19. Davies, Athenian Propertied Families, p. 381.
- 20. Cf. Hdt. 5, 55-65.
- 21. See A. J. Podlecki, "The Political Significance of the Athenian 'Tyrannicide'-Cult," *Historia* 15 (1966): 129-41; C. Fornara, "The 'Tradition' About the Murder of Hipparchus," *Historia* 17 (1966): 400-424, and "The Cult of Harmodius and Aristogiton," *Philologus* 114 (1970): 155-80.
 - 22. See n. 15 above.
 - 23. See Plut. Per. 7. 1-2, and cf. 16. 1 and 39. 5.
- 24. Note that Pericles was reluctant to enter public life as a young man and apparently did not do so officially until the late 460s (Plut. Cim. 14. 4); cf. A. J. Podlecki, The Political Background of Aeschylean Tragedy (Ann Arbor, 1966), p. 34. His public debut was much earlier, however, as χορηγός in 472 for Aeschylus' Persians, which flattered the Athenians for their victory over the Persians (and the Pisistratids).

I should like to thank the Editor and the anonymous referees for their very helpful comments and suggestions.